



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/385,489	08/30/1999	THOMAS J. SULLIVAN	0110754/629	9228

7590 12/04/2001

BELL BOYD & LLOYD
P O BOX 1135
CHICAGO, IL 606901135

EXAMINER

LASTRA, DANIEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2162

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/385,489

Applicant(s)
Sullivan et al

Examiner
Dan Lastra

Group Art Unit
2162



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dan Lastra

(3) Adam Masia

(2) James Myhre

(4) Richard Windish

Date of Interview Oct 30, 2001

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 30, 37, and 77

Identification of prior art discussed:
Fajkowski (5,905,246)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Examiner agreed that the cited reference pertained to consumer promotion, not trade promotions between the manufacturer and the merchant as discussed by Applicant. The Examiner further noted that Claim 1, in particular, and other independent and dependent claims seem to read directly on the subject matter disclosed in the Background of the Invention. The Applicant explained the novel features of his invention and how they were an improvement over the current state of the art by placing the trade promotion data into databases where the interested parties could access it. The Examiner noted that automation of a known process was not novel. After further discussion, the Applicant agreed to submit a formal amendment incorporating more details into the independent claims within the next few days. The Examiner noted that further search would probably be required based on the proposed changes.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

James W. MYHRE
PATENT EXAMINER